

MAR 25 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ARTURO OROZCO ZAMARRIPA;
MARIA DE LA LUZ GONZALEZ
GUTIERREZ,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72138

Agency Nos. A096-491-208
A096-491-209

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 18, 2009^{**}

Before: LEAVY, HAWKINS, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Arturo Orozco Zamarripa and Maria De La Luz Gonzalez Gutierrez, married
natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *Perez v. Mukasey*, 516 F.3d 770, 773 (9th Cir. 2008), we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Petitioners’ motion to reopen because the BIA considered the evidence they submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA’s denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is “arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.”).

Petitioners’ contention that the BIA failed to consider some or all of the evidence they submitted with the motion to reopen is not supported by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.